REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action in the present application. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicant expresses his appreciation to Examiner Temica M. Beamer for the courtesy of an interview which was granted to applicant and his representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856). The interview was held at the USPTO on January 12, 2005. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Interview Summary, Paper No. 20050112 and includes the amendments made to claim 1 hereinabove, which were worked out in the course of the interview.

Applicant has amended claim 1 as indicated in the interview and has also amended system claim 33 accordingly to stress that the parsing and the formatting of the information take place at a server, rather than at the source of the information or at the wireless device.

Claims 1 - 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by De Boor et al, U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0093376. De Boor et al describes a system wherein web content is manually adapted for use and display on wireless devices, by inserting special tags into the web content source code at the source of the information. A browser, located at the wireless device, employs the tags and displays the information at the wireless device. The browser, located and operative at the wireless device, includes browsing functionality.

Claims 1 and 33 have been amended to distinguish over the prior art by specifying that parsing and classifying take place not at the wireless device but rather at a server which supplies web content from a web site to the wireless device in a suitable format, based on importance of information to the user.

Dependent claims 2 - 8 and 34 - 40 have been amended for clarity and the remaining dependent claims have been canceled without prejudice.

Additional prior art to Tran et al and Rhoads et al which was cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been carefully considered by applicant and is not believed to impact on the patentability of the claims as amended.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the remaining claims are deemed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

#UYIAN COHEN! / ## LADAS & PARRY MP ## WEST 61st STREET **NEW YORK, N. Y. 10023 ## N6. 20302 (212) 708-1887